

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-31, 35, 37, 95, 98-109, 111, 113-117, 119 and 121-139 remain in the case.

Claims 1, 3, 28 though 31, 95, 98, 111 and 119 have been amended herein and Claims 12, 32, 84 through 94, 97, 112, 118 and 120 have been cancelled herein. Claims 33, 34, 36, 38-83, 96 and 110 were cancelled in a previous amendment. Claim 139 is new. The amendments entered herein were made in view of the Office Action and to better define what the Applicants consider their invention, as fully supported by an enabling disclosure. No new matter has been added by the foregoing amendments.

In particular, independent Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled dependent Claim 12, independent Claim 31 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled dependent Claim 32, independent Claim 95 has been amended include the limitations of cancelled dependent Claim 97, independent Claim 111 has been amended include the limitations of cancelled dependent Claim 112 and independent Claim 119 has been amended include the limitations of cancelled dependent Claim 120.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 29 was objected to for insufficient antecedent basis, Claim 98 was objected to for a clerical error, and Claim 91 was objected to as being the same as Claim 111. Applicants submit that the claims as amended overcome these objections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 95, 107-109, 119, 121, 123, 125, 137 and 138 as being anticipated by Herrick (U.S. Patent No. 4,998,187) and therefore not in conformance with 35 U.S.C. §102, and rejected Claims 1-7, 13, 17, 19-20, 24-25, 31, 84, 91-92, 111, 117, 119, 124 and 126 as being unpatentable over Herrick in view of various other patents and thus not in conformance with 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows. Under the heading “Allowable Subject Matter,” the Examiner has objected to Claims 11-12, 28, 32, 85-89, 97-106, 112-116, 120, 122 and 127-136 as being dependent upon rejected base claims but would allow the claims if they were rewritten in independent form. As discussed above, Claim 1 as amended includes the limitations of allowed and now cancelled dependent Claim 12 and therefore Applicant submits that Claim 1 is an allowable claim. Similarly, independent Claim 31 has been amended to include the limitations of allowed and now cancelled dependent Claim 32 and therefore is an allowable claim, independent Claim 95 has been amended include the limitations of allowed and now cancelled dependent Claim 97 and therefore is an allowable claim, independent Claim 111 has been amended include the limitations of allowed and now cancelled dependent Claim 112 and therefore is an allowable claim and independent Claim 119 has been amended include the limitations of allowed and now cancelled dependent Claim 120 and therefore is an allowable claim. As the remaining claims all depend from allowable claims, it is submitted that they, too, are allowable claims.

CONCLUSION

The rejections of the original claims are believed to have been overcome by the present remarks and amendments. From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such an action is earnestly solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account No. 07-1509 for any deficiencies or overages in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.

Dated: January 4, 2007

By: /jrr/
Nicholas A. Kees
Registration No. 29,552
Jennifer R. Racine
Registration No. 56,874

Attorneys of Record for the Applicant
GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3590
Phone: (414) 273-3500
Facsimile: (414) 273-5198
E-mail: nkees@gklaw.com
E-mail: jracine@gklaw.com